

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to FIG 1. This sheet, which includes FIG 1, replaces the original sheet including FIG 1. In FIG 1, the second element 100 corresponding to the output device has been properly labeled "110."

Attachment: Replacement Sheet
Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the through examination of the present application as evidenced by the Office Action of July 28, 2006. Applicant has filed concurrently herewith an information disclosure statement and PTO 1449 citing documents from the Related Art section of the present application. Applicant includes a copy of the information disclosure statement and PTO 1449 herewith for the Examiner's reference. Applicant has amended FIG 1 as set out above to correct a typographical error in FIG 1. Applicant has also amended Claim 34 to address the objection thereto. Applicant has also amended Claim 18 to recite that it depends from "Claim 17" as this was previously omitted inadvertently. Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is condition for allowance for at least the reasons discussed herein.

The Information Disclosure Statement

The Office Action states that the references listed in the Related Art section of the present application have not been properly cited in an information disclosure statement (IDS). *See* Office Action, page 2. Applicant has filed an IDS and PTO 1449 concurrently herewith including the references discussed in the Related Art section of the present application. Applicant has included a copy of the IDS and PTO 1449 herewith for the Examiner's reference. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the references listed on the 1449 and inclusion of these references on the face of any patent issued for the present application.

The Drawings

The Office Action objects to FIG 1 as having two element 100s and no output device 110. As set out on the annotated sheet showing changes made and the replacement sheet including FIG 1, Applicant has amended one of the element 100s to be a "110" to properly indicate the output device 110 discussed in the specification. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the objections with respect to the drawings be withdrawn for at least these reasons.

Claim Objections

The Office Action objects to apparatus Claim 34 as depending from method Claim 1. Applicant has amended Claim 34 as set out above to properly depend from Claim 33. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection with respect to Claim 33 be withdrawn for at least these reasons.

The Section 103 Rejections

Claims 1-36 and 38-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by United States Patent Publication No. 2002/0173347 to Kinnunen (hereinafter "Kinnunen"). See Office Action, page 3. Applicant respectfully disagrees. For example, Claim 1 recites:

A method of controlling connection between a plurality of connectable devices, the method comprising:
associating individual indicia with a first device having a predetermined identity and being connectable to a second device; and
outputting said indicia in a manner that is observable by a user in response to said first device being selected for connection to said second device.

Independent Claim 33 contains corresponding apparatus recitations. Furthermore, Independent Claims 38 and 40 contain similar method and apparatus recitations, respectively. Applicant respectfully submits that at least the highlighted recitations of Claim 1 are neither disclosed nor suggested by Kinnunen for at least the reasons discussed herein.

In particular, Kinnunen discusses a method and system for automatically connecting a mobile terminal of a "default" user to a hands-free unit 230. See Kinnunen, Figure 3, blocks 300-370 and paragraphs 21 and 22. If the mobile terminal of the default user is not within range, the system tries to connect the "last user" to the hands-free unit 230. See Kinnunen, Figure 3, blocks 330-340 and 380 and paragraphs 27 and 28. Finally, if neither the default user nor the last user is within range, the system awaits a signal from other users. See Kinnunen, Figure 3, blocks 350-360 and 390 and paragraphs 29 and 30. The only reference to indicator lights in Kinnunen is a reference to indicator lights on the remote control 120 (Figure 1) and the specification states that "one or more indicator lights and one or more controls and/or push buttons" may be included. See Kinnunen, paragraph 17 and Figure 1. Nothing about the purpose or use of the indicator lights is present in the specification of

Kinnunen.

In stark contrast, Claim 1 of the present invention recites associating individual indicia, for example, a light emitting device (LED) having a specific color, with a first device having a predetermined identity, such as a mobile telephone. In other words, a particular mobile telephone is associated with a specific indicia or color. Claim 1 further recites outputting the indicia, for example, illuminating the specific LED, in a manner that is observable by a user in response to, for example, a call from the first device. In other words, the user of embodiments of the present invention will know which device is receiving a call by the color of the LED that appears on the accessory device 100. *See Detailed Description, Figure 1 and related text.* Nothing in Kinnunen either discloses or suggests a method or device that associates a specific indicia, such as an LED having a specific color, with a specific device, such that the illumination of the LED or occurrence of the indicia whatever it may be indicates to the user that a call is being received by the specific device associated with the indicia. As discussed above, Kinnunen discusses a method and system for automatically connecting users of one or more mobile devices to a hands-free unit 230 in an automobile. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is patentable over Kinnunen for at least the reasons discussed herein.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that independent Claims 1, 33, 38 and 40 are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons discussed herein. Furthermore, the dependent claims are patentable over the cited references at least per the patentability of the independent base claims from which they depend.

The Dependent Claims

Claims 2-32, 34-36, 39 and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Kinnunen. *See Office Action, page 3.* Claims 25-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Kinnunen. *See Office Action, page 16.* As discussed above, the dependent claims are patentable over the cited references at least per the patentability of the independent base claims from which they depend. However, many of the dependent claims are also separately patentable over Kinnunen.

For example, Claims 25, 26 and 27 recite wherein the indicia is a combination of characters that is output by means of a display, wherein the indicia is audible

and is output by means of a sound emitting device and wherein the indicia is tactile and is output by means of a sensory detectable stimulation device, respectively. The Office Action admits that Kinnunen does not teach the recitations of these claims. *See* Office Action, page 16. However, the Office Action states:


Nonetheless, the Examiner takes Official Notice of the fact that Kinnunen discloses indicator lights to indicate to the user/driver of a connection between various mobile telephones and the hands-free device. Any other type of indication would achieve the same objective of notifying the user/driver of this type of connection.

See Office Action, page 16. Applicant respectfully disagrees. As discussed above, the indicator lights discussed at paragraph 17 of Kinnunen are generic indicator lights that may be present on the remote control. Applicant admits that indicator lights are known. It is the use of the indicator lights or any indicia according to embodiments of the present invention that is novel. Nothing in Kinnunen discloses or suggests the use of indicia as recited in the claims of the present inventor for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to the independent claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 25-27 are separately patentable over Kinnunen for at least these additional reasons.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested in due course. It is not believed that any extension of time is required for this paper. However, in the event that an extension of time is necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such an extension is hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a). Any additional fees believed to be due in connection with this paper may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 50-0220.

Respectfully submitted,



Elizabeth A. Stanek
Registration No. 48,568

USPTO Customer No. 54414
Myers Bigel Sibley & Sajovec, P.A.
Post Office Box 37428
Raleigh, North Carolina 27627
Telephone: (919) 854-1400
Facsimile: (919) 854-1401

In re: Anders Angelhag
Serial No.: 10/560,791
Filed: December 15, 2005
Page 13 of 13

CERTIFICATION OF ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 CFR § 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted electronically to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on
October 30, 2006.



Erin A. Campion

Date of Signature: October 30, 2006

1/3 Annotated Sheet




FIG 1